

# Minutes January 6, 2005

# Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

## I. Call to order

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:00 p.m.

Board members present: Chair: Snodgrass, Co-chair: Seth Kelsey, Boardmembers: Margeson, Degenstein, Callister, Ladd, and Youth Advocate: Jones

Absent and Excused: Park Board member: Stewart and Youth Advocate: Zak

City staff present: Timothy Cox, Park Planning Manager; Dave Tuchek, Park Operations Manager; Lori Peckol, Planner - Dept. of Planning & Community Development; Jeff Churchill, Planning Intern - Dept. of Community Development; and Sharon Sato, Park Board Recording Secretary.

## II. Items from the Audience

Bob Yoder - Redmond/Education Hill resident (Handout)

Mr. Yoder, discussed the park and wetlands aspect of Hartman Park. Mr. Yoder reviewed what he considered some of the wetland aspects of the Park:

- Sound barrier Yoder urged the Park Board to treat the park as a natural resource including trails, entire park area, wetlands; and urged the Board and staff to protect and preserve it.
- Functions park's proximity to schools (high school, elementary schools)
- Mr. Yoder inquired if the Board/City would consider hiring an inspector to seek out information in the City's behalf to inspect land/property which the City either owns or is interested in purchasing.
- Two inspectors had previously inspected the wetlands near Hartman Herrera Environmental Consultants hired by Burnstead, and possibly the City, in 1997, to inspect and monitor the wetlands over a five-year period for

Redmond Park Board January 6, 2004 Page 2

run off issues from Lookout Ridge site. Shultz Environmental Consultants were hired by CamWest in 2004. Both inspected under the same code and criteria of the Redmond Municipal Code, both interpreted the code differently. If the City hired their own inspector, wetlands and property would be objectively interpreted by City code.

• In summary - Herrera's report indicates that the wetlands at Hartman are considered bogs (high resource), Class I areas. Yoder inquired if there was, a way of developing a history for the wetlands by monitoring the bog.

Snodgrass stated that the Board would review the handout material and take the information under advisement. She also asked City Planning staff to review and advise the Board.

## III. Approval of Minutes

Motion for approval of the December 2, 2004 Redmond Park Board minutes as

presented

Motion by: Kelsey Second by: Ladd

Motion carried: 6-0 unanimous

## IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

<u>PowerPoint presentation</u> - Staff will make this presentation at the Education Hill and North Redmond Neighborhood Planning Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting to be held on Monday, January 10 at the City of Redmond Tech. Center, to aid in the neighborhood planning efforts.

<u>"How Far is too Far"</u> - American Planning Association article summarizing several studies related to users of parks and desirable distances to parks. Cox felt this article might be valuable in the Park Board's current "neighborhood by neighborhood" parks system evaluation, and may also be used as a reference, in the Education Hill and North Redmond Neighborhoods Citizen Advisory Committee planning effort.

Kelsey suggested that this article might be useful in discussions pertaining to the survey in reference to the bond/financial issue.

## V. <u>OLD BUSINESS</u>

## A. Cricket Club - Shekar Udi and Phan' Chitneri

A summary of the 2004 Cricket season activities was given by Udi, Manager and Chitneri, President, of the Redmond Colts Cricket Club. Both men thanked the Board and Parks staff, on behalf of the Club, for their cooperation, efforts, guidance and implementation of guidelines (parking, safety measures, maintenance, etc.) a combination which made the first season very successful. The season proceeded without incident or complaints.

Udi presented a plaque, to the Park Board and Parks staff, on behalf of the Redmond Colts, in appreciation for their cooperation in bringing forth a successful first cricket season.

Snodgrass noted that this has been a very successful partnership and staff looks forward to another great year.

## B. Central Park Master Plan Adoption

Cox handed out the final draft copy of the Central Park MP. Snodgrass asked the Board to note any errors for staff correction - Larrissa Jones name - capitalization error. Cox noted that the Table of Contents required some modification, page numbering was not 100% accurate; illustration labeling needs correction, three additional sketches need to be added and the report shall be copied double sided with color copied appendices. Degenstein stated that the final approved Master Plan should include Phase I inventory amenities.

Cox noted that two scenarios were available to the Board; 1) Park Board can recommend approval to text tonight from previous examination of the document; or 2) Board members can go through the document again, taking 1-2 weeks to re-exam, comments e-mailed to Tim Cox.

Board members agreed that they would like to review the document and will get comments back to staff via e-mail within the next two weeks. Staff will provide the Board with an errata of the document since the first draft was produced.

## C. Trust for Public Lands Telephone Survey

Redmond Park Board January 6, 2004 Page 4

The Board received a draft copy of the telephone survey from Trust for Public Lands, with minor edits by staff. General comments by staff and Board members:

- Questions too long
- Questions have been 80% approved by prior survey use
- Staff feels the questions are reliable
- Questions and length of questions too long, appropriate?
- Validity of environmental questions relating air quality issues does Redmond have a pollution problem
- How will the public perceive these questions
- What is the public ready to do shades of grey for success
- Comments back to TPL
- Repetition of questions
- Better understanding of process and questions
- Will questions used for other cities work for Redmond?

Cox asked the Board to e-mail any further questions or comments to him or staff within the next two week. Cox will be forwarding those remarks to TLP for consideration after comments are received from the Board.

#### VI. New Business

# A. <u>Comprehensive Plan and Benchmark Program - Lori Peckol/Jeff Churchill</u> (Handout)

Churchill, Intern for the Planning and Development Dept., gave a short briefing on the Comprehensive Plan. Churchill reported that the Plan underwent a major update last year with the process almost completed. All elements were updated including the Parks Recreation and Arts section, however, the Plan needs to be continually updated and implemented. A new element was added, "Participation, Evaluation and Implementation" - this new element calls for a more structured approach to the Plan implementation and evaluation. There are two parts to the implementation program: 1) Implementation Actions and; 2) Benchmark measures. Implementation Actions answer - What does the City need to do to implement its plan? This section would include:

Update regulations to be consistent with the plan update

- Implement programs most called for in policy e.g., pilot program for affordable housing
- Building capital facilities e.g., enhancing existing parks or building a new one

Benchmark Programs - How is the city doing in meeting its goals?

 Goals - framework goals and other different elements of the Comp Plan (goals are listed on a handout) - goals drive policies in the Comp Plan and regulations flow from them (ex. Gauge quantity and park space within City, information (gather data) from all departments of the City merged to "Big Picture" view of City happenings.) Providing high quality service to citizens of Redmond.

The Planning Department would like Park Board input on this program. Draft benchmarks were handed out to the Board for their review and input. Churchill asked the Board to report on what is necessary data to be gathered and reported on, what is unnecessary, difficult to find and what might be missing.

Snodgrass noted that park elements (amenities within parks), which were not shown on the draft benchmark program list, should be an addition.

Other cities, including King County, have benchmark programs. Websites are available for viewing.

Peckol noted that it is the goal of the Planning Dept. to measure benchmarks and make a decision as to how often reports should be generated - annually, every five years, etc. Planning's goal is to review and update yearly in the beginning of the process.

Churchill noted that the Planning Dept. would like to bring forth this report to the Planning Commission the first quarter of 2005. After Park Board and community input, the Planning Commission will review it to provide input and make changes, City Council will review the final copy before adoption.

Staff will meet with the Planning Department, and the Park Board will put Benchmark Programs on their February or March agenda. Cox suggested that review the Comprehensive Plan Park Policies might be helpful in reviewing the Benchmark program.

Peckol noted that the measures reported will be supplemental information to Comprehensive Plan updates.

Planning will establish benchmarks for various elements, the Park Board will review, every year those elements will be measured, which will be trended over time to see how the City is doing. Peckol noted that during this time the Transportation Plan will be proceeding, of which a monitoring element will be a part of the benchmark program.

Comments should be e-mailed to Tim Cox for staff discussion and rescheduling to the Park Board.

Peckol asked the Board to check the list and add any items they felt would be particularly valuable in accessing Parks Department projects..

Churchill and Peckol will attend the next meeting regarding this issue.

## B. <u>Evaluation - Introduction/Grass Lawn Neighborhoods - Step 2</u>

Cox summarized Step 2 is to evaluate each existing park and recreational amenities in the neighborhood. Evaluation included PRO Plan review, site visits review of neighborhood plans, maintenance and operations, Recreation programming and planning - SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. Staff has put together a draft of the Grass Lawn (GL) Neighborhood resources, including the neighborhood itself, the GL community park, Spiritbrook Neighborhood Park, Scotts Pond, and school district sites (Ben Rush and Rose Hill).

Cox's handouts included inventory in PRO Plan - Grass Lawn and Rose Hill. Additionally, trails - Bridle Crest Trail on the south of neighborhood, and PSE right-of-way trail running north/south within western portions of the neighborhood.

Comments and Level 3 discussion will take place at February's meeting - along with summary of SWOT - what needs to be done in this neighborhood and priorities (replacements, repairs, etc.)

## C. Redmond Baseball Association Banner - Tuchek

Degenstein asked staff to help clarify the City's current sign/banner policy. His concern is the City's need to establish procedures that would be

followed through by all user groups Degenstein felt that aesthetically the park did not look like a park with banners hanging on the fence all year round.

Tuchek noted that staff had, most recently, done a better job at managing/monitoring the banner/sign situation at Hartman. Staff put together banner/sign policies which became part of the agreement between the City and user groups, signed by the Director of Parks and Recreation, Parks staff and LL Organizations. Agreements will be signed within the next month or so.

Snodgrass added there had been no communication between the Board and user groups in reference to the banner/sign placement, and no representatives from any of the groups had attended any of the meetings. She also noted that in the event a user group wanted to extended placement of a sign for extended months, a variance would need to be applied for, none have been requested. It was reiterated that all banners need to be approved by the Parks and Recreation Director (size, material type, wording, etc.) before they are put up.

Tuchek will have staff remove signs from the fencing at Hartman and open dialogue with user groups on agreement rules and regulations. Staff will keep the Park Board updated.

Motion by Degenstein:

Subject to the following conditions, all organizations entering into an agreement with the City, complying with all the criteria of the policies, including definitive date - beginning and end for placing banners, approval by Director of Parks and Recreation the visual aspects of the banners; the Park Board is in favor of banners being posted at Hartman Park.

Motion carried: 5 in favor - 1 against

#### VII. Reports - Project

## A. Hartman Park Infield - Tuchek

The Board received photos of the current infield "cut outs" at Hartman Park. Tuchek reported that the contract was being executed now; the

Redmond Park Board January 6, 2004 Page 8

contractor has inspected and was in the process of removing the soil in the "cut outs", replacing it with field turf.

Staff met with baseball groups and the High School to discuss process. The field modifications are modeled after the field at WSU (Washington State University). This will increase the safety margin in field use. This will also lessen future field maintenance costs.

## VIII. Coming Attractions

## A. 2005-2006 Capital Improvement Program Projects

Cox reported that funding has been secured for 2005 to start two park projects. Plans are in progress. More information at future meeting.

## B. Teen Center Meeting Location

February's Board meeting will be held at the Teen Center. Snodgrass will contact Ken Wong, OFH Director, to find out teen count on Thursday nights. Snodgrass would like teen participation at the February meeting.

Degenstein suggested prior notice by putting a notice on the bulletin board at the Center, also to have a set agenda closely directed toward teen interest. He also suggested a 30 minute "open mike" discussing teen issues.

Display boards will be set up pertaining to current Park projects - Municipal Campus Master Plan, location of Trails and Parks in Redmond, etc.

Board members are asked to submit agenda topics to Tim Cox via e-mail with cc to Ken Wong, Shannon Roach and Becca Bregal.

## IX. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Kelsey Second by: Ladd Approved: 6-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

January 6, 2004	
Page 9	
By:	
Lori Snodgrass, Chair	Date

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Redmond Park Board

Next Regular Meeting February 3, 2005 7:00 p.m.

Location: Old Firehouse Teen Center